



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,454	12/08/2003	Arne Agerlin Olsen	5676.210-US	3283
25908 7590 02/15/2008 NOVOZYMES NORTH AMERICA, INC. 500 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 1600 NEW YORK, NY 10110				
EXAMINER				
LIU, SUE XU				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1639				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Continuation Sheet

Item 3

Applicant's proposed amendments would bring new structural and/or functional limitations (e.g. "subtilisin 309 variant", "an epitope pattern is an IgE epitope pattern" for "subtilisin 309 variant") into the pending claims (e.g. Claims 22 and 24), and thus would require new searches in both prior art considerations and other issues for patentability determination. In addition, the proposed amendments to the claims would also raise the issue of new matter. The recitation "an epitope pattern is an IgE epitope pattern" for "subtilisin 309 variant" in the proposed instant claims does not appear to have support in the instant disclosure as originally filed. Thus, the proposed claim amendments as filed on 1/28/08 will not be entered.

Item 11

As discussed under Item 3, the instant claims as would be amended are not entered due to consideration of new issues.

All previously set forth claim rejections are maintained for the reason of record:

A.) Claims 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

B.) Claims 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making and using protein variants based on Savinase listed on pp. 54-58

Art Unit: 1639

of the instant specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for making and using for protein variants that are based on other parent proteins.

C.) Claims 24, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

D.) Claims 22-26 and 28 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 102(b)** as being anticipated by Lovborg et al (WO 92/10755; 6/25/1992; cited in IDS, filed 12/8/03).

E.) Claims 22-26 and 28 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 22-24, and 26-29 of copending Application No. 09/957806 (20050181446; 9/21/01).

/S. L./

Examiner, Art Unit 1639

/Jon D. Epperson/

Primary Examiner, AU 1639